

BRHADĀRANYAKOPANIṢAD- BHĀṢYA-VĀRTIKA

(BUBV 2.5)

मधुब्राह्मणम्

BUBV 2.5 is the concluding *brāhmaṇa* 'section' of the Madhukāṇḍa (BU chh. 1-2). Here Sureśvara confirms and assures that the Madhukāṇḍa constitutes the essence of ŚatBr. The Kāṇva-recension of ŚatBr consists of 17 *kāṇḍas* 'books'. The first two *adhyāyas* of the 17th book of it are called BĀ and then following six *adhyāyas* thereof, viz. BĀ chh. 3-8, are called BU. The first two chapters of BU, viz. BĀ 3-4, are called the Madhukāṇḍa. [To be precise, tradition calls BU chh. 3-4 (BĀ chh. 5-6) the Yājñavalkyakāṇḍa (or Munikāṇḍa) and BU chh. 5-6 (BĀ chh. 7-8) the Khilakāṇḍa.¹]

नमोऽसाधारणज्ञातृज्ञानज्ञेयात्मबोधने ।

जग्धाशेषमहाविद्यातज्ज्ञानार्थाय विष्णवे ॥१॥

[Sureśvara begins this last section of the Madhukāṇḍa (viz. BU 2.5), with a *maṅgalaśloka*.² SP points out the alternative purposes of this *maṅgala*: (i) In keeping with the tradition which Patāñjali has noted in his *Mahābhāṣya* regarding the *maṅgalācaraṇa*, viz. *maṅgala* should be observed even in the middle of a Śāstric text, as in the beginning and at the end of it; or (ii) the earlier two sections have clarified the meanings of the different words in the Śruti and now begins an exposition of the purport of the 'sentence' in the same. This necessitates the *maṅgalācaraṇa*; or (iii) *maṅgala* marks the conclusion of the Madhukāṇḍa.]

1. BUB p. 369, lines 1-2; p. 697, line 7; ABUB p. 369, lines 1-3; p. 697, lines 8-9; BUBV 3.1.1-2 and 4-5; 5.1.1-2.

2. Actually BU 2.6 which follows this section is described as the ending section of the Madhukāṇḍa, but it consists of only six verses and states nothing significant; see Appendix.

Salutation to Viṣṇu¹ who is possessed of the uncommon nature of (the triad, viz.) knower, knowing and object of knowing,² who knows his own nature, (and) who destroyed (lit. devoured) the extensive Ignorance³ and the evil resulting therefrom in their entirety. [1]

¹Though this is the name of a god, it can be understood in the sense of the individual consciousness, this sense being derived from root *viṣ* 'to pervade' (the entire body).

²Cf. BG 18.18: *jñānam jñeyam parijñātā trividhā karma-codanā/ karaṇam karma karteti trividhaḥ karma-saṁgrahaḥ*||

³There are two types of *avidyās*, viz. *mūlāvidyā* and *tūlāvidyā*. The former is the force overpowering the Brahman, viz. *māyā*, which has been ever there, i.e. beginningless. It is termed simply as *avidyā* also. The latter is the effect of the former; it is an error on the part of an individual. The two *avidyās* are sometimes identified with *tattvāgrahaṇa* and *tattvānyathāgrahaṇa* respectively. Also cf. the *Vedāntakalpataru* p. 3, lines 16-17.

प्रत्यग्वान्तसमुच्छेदि ज्ञानमैकात्म्यनिष्ठितम् ।
संन्याससाधनं प्रोक्तममृतत्वंकसाधनम् ॥२॥

[Thus Sureśvara summarises the contents of BU 2.4 in order to point out the connection between BU 2.4 and BU 2.5.]

It is declared (in the preceding section) that Knowledge is the destroyer of darkness (viz. Ignorance) in its fullness (*saṁ*) in respect of the (nature of) individual consciousness, (firmly) based on the uniqueness of the Ātman, and the (potent) means to renunciation (of all attachment to body) which is the sole means to immortality.¹ [2]

¹BUBV 2.4.23: *tyāga eva hi sarveṣāṁ mokṣa-sādhanaṁ uttamam/ tyajataiva hi taj jñeyam tyaktuḥ pratyak param padam*|| On this see Hino (1982), p. 87.

हेतवोऽपि च तत्सिद्धौ श्रवणादिपुरःसराः ।
उक्ता यथावत्तत्रैव श्रोतव्यः श्रुतिवाक्यतः ॥३॥

मन्तव्यो हेतुभिः सूक्ष्मैरुक्तदृष्टान्तबोधितैः ।

चित्सामान्यचिदुत्पत्तिचिदेकप्रलयात्मभिः ॥४॥

[These verses show that not only is renunciation necessary for acquiring the Knowledge (i.e. causing the rise of Knowledge) (as stated above) but *śravaṇa* etc. also are the means to the same.]

And in order to acquire that (knowledge), the means, viz. those beginning with 'hearing',¹ are also declared there: from the Śruti passages,² ' (the Ātman is) to be heard' [3]

' (the Ātman is) to be thought of' with the help of subtle reasons which are conveyed by the already stated examples,³ which have the purport that this has Sentiency (alone) as its generality, originates from Sentiency (alone) and which merges (also) into Sentiency alone.⁴ [4]

¹Cf. BU 2.4.5: *ātmā vā are draṣṭavyaḥ śrotavyo mantavyo nīdīdhyāsitavyaḥ*.

²The word *śruti-vākyaṭaḥ* may mean either 'from the passages from the Śruti texts' or 'from the Śrutis and the instruction of teachers'. The latter interpretation is supported by *śrotavyaḥ pūrvam āgamataś ca* (BUBV 2.4.5), *āgama-darśanam pūrvam āgamācāryato matiḥ* (BUBV 2.4.218) and *tatra śrotavyaḥ ācāryāgamābhyām* (BUB 2.5.1).

³These are stated in BU 2.4.7-12: 'A drum, a conch and a Vīṇā and their sounds' (7-9); 'smoke and fire as its origin' (10); 'waters and ocean as their merging place' (11); 'water and salt which is poured into it and remains there invisibly and pervading all of it' (12).

⁴Here only *śravaṇa* and *manana* are a little clarified, *nīdīdhyā-sana* is not spoken of.

आशङ्क्य हेत्वसिद्धत्वं मधुब्राह्मणमुच्यते ।

कुतोऽसिद्धत्वमिति चेच्छृणु तद्गदतो मम ॥५॥

[Here begins the discussion of BU 2.5.]

Keeping in view (the possibility) that the (earlier sta-

ted) reasons can be (taken by some¹) as not justified, exposition is now given on the section on Madhu. If (one would ask), 'Owing to what (is this) unjustified character of the reasons?', (I have to say,) 'Hear while I explain the same.'

[5]

¹This refers to the Sāṃkhyas and others, also possibly the Naiyāyikās who hold similar (views); see the next verse.

निःसामान्यविशेषत्वाच्चित्सामान्यं कथं भवेत् ।
चिदुत्पत्तिलयासिद्धिः सांख्यादीन्प्रति वादिनः ॥६॥

How can Sentiency be the generic characteristic, because it is devoid of generality or particularity?¹ (The view of the Vedāntin, viz.) the origination (of this world) is from Sentiency and its merger (also) is into Sentiency, is not justified (with reason only) for the contenders, the Sāṃkhya and others.²

[6]

¹Notions of *viśeṣa* and *sāmānya* cannot be associated with the Ātman, for the Ātman is *nitya*, *eka* and *anekānugata*. On this, cf. BUBV 1.4.656-657. The Ātman (or Sentiency) is ever described in the Śrutis as *avyāvṛtta*, *ananugata*; cf. BUBV 1.4.529; 4.4.569; Hino (1982), p. 299.

²Śaṅkara has pointed out the views of all these thus: *na yathokta-viśeṣaṇasya jagato yathokta-viśeṣaṇam īśvaram muktvānyataḥ pradhānād acetanād aṇubhyo 'bhāvāt saṃsāriṇo vā utpattyādi sambhāvayitum śakyam* (BSB 1.1.2, p, 88, lines 2-3).

ऐकात्म्यवस्तुतात्पर्यं हेत्वादिच्छद्मनोच्यते ।
वेदे यतो न हेत्वादि लोकवत्स्याद्विवक्षितम् ॥७॥

(This is so) because, in the Veda, is stated its purport, viz. the uniqueness of the Reality, under the garb of (its being) the origin etc.¹ (of this world),² (there) it is not intended to state the origin etc. (of this world) in the worldly way.³

[7]

¹This is *janman* 'origin', *sthiti* 'sustenance' and *pralaya* 'merger'.

²This is a reference to the *sr̥ṣṭi-vākyas* in particular.

³This may refer to the use of logic in all worldly discussion, though SP and NKL make a reference to the Vaiśeṣika view of the *ārambhavāda* and the Sāṃkhya view.

चित्तत्वं सदविद्यावत्कारणत्वं निगच्छति ।

चित्सामान्याद्यतः सिद्धं प्रागप्येतत्प्रसाधितम् ॥८॥

(The Śruti-) conclusion establishes that Sentiency, the (only) existent principle, is the cause of what is made of ignorance, for the reason that it has Sentiency as its generic characteristic. I have already shown this earlier.¹ [8]

¹BUBV 2.4.282: *evam cid-anvayāt sarvas tad-adhyastah samīkṣyate/ sāmānyam vā viśeṣo vā cidasambodha-hetutah*|| On this, see Hino (1982), p. 208. Also compare BU 1.4.7: *tad dheham...etc.*

अभ्युपेत्याप्यसिद्धत्वं तत्सिद्धत्वाभिधित्सया ।

मधुब्राह्मणमारब्धमियमित्याद्यथोत्तरम् ॥९॥

[This verse speaks of the purpose of the Madhubrāhmaṇa (MB) 'section on Madhu' which begins with the words, *iyam (pr̥thivi)*..., for one would consider it purposeless if the Siddhāntin argued that there was already a proof given of Sentiency being the generic characteristic of the world.]

Yet, even granting that (the earlier statement about Sentiency) is not justified with reason, this later section on Madhu is now begun (by the seer) with the desire to re-affirm the same with the words, *iyam (pr̥thivi...)*. [9]

प्रतिदेहं लयोत्पत्तिश्रुतेर्ह्यात्मनि शङ्क्यते ।

भेदोऽतस्तन्निवृत्त्यर्थं मधुत्वेनैकतोच्यते ॥१०॥

Since there is a (statement of the) Śruti that each and every body merges in and originates from (the Ātman),¹ it may be suspected that there is numerousness of the Ātman

(=Jīvātman associated with every different body). Hence, in order to obviate that doubt, the uniqueness of the Ātman is declared (by stating it) to be Madhu. [10]

¹Cf. for example BU 4.3.8: *sa vā ayam puruṣo jāyamānaḥ śariram abhisampadyamānaḥ pāpmabhiḥ saṁsṛjyate* which would forcefully lead to the idea of differentiation of the numerous Ātmans.

उपकार्योपकारित्वभिन्नं यज्जगदीक्ष्यते ।

उपकार्योपकारित्वात्तत्स्यादेकात्मतत्त्वकम् ॥११॥

Since it is noticed that the world is characterised as the benefitted and the benefactor (which are its components)¹, therefore, on account of its being comprised of the components, (viz.) the benefitted and the benefactor, it should be held as (the product of one cause) of one uniform nature (viz. the individual consciousness).² [11]

¹The relation of *upakārya-upakārin* is possible only if the notion of duality is held. Śaṅkara discusses this relation in BUB 2.5.1 (p. 344, line 9 to p. 345, line 1) and BSB 2.3.43.

²That which is the product is similar to its cause. Therefore the world of duality must have a cause, viz. it is marked by duality. Such is the individual consciousness, wrapped as it is by *avidyā*. SP points out *svapna-dvaita* for clarifying this cause and effect relation. On this, cf. GK 2.4; 3.29^a; 4.62^a.

प्रतिज्ञायाथवैकात्म्यं हेतूनुक्तवोक्तसिद्धय ।

निगमायोत्तरो ग्रन्थः प्रतिज्ञाया विवक्षितः ॥१२॥

प्रतिज्ञातार्थसिद्धयर्थं हेतूनुक्त्वा पृथग्विधान् ।

हेतोर्निगमनं पश्चात्क्रियतेऽथोत्तरोक्तिभिः ॥१३॥

[These verses present another way of explaining the relationship between BU 2.4 and BU 2.5: BU 2.5 is intended to serve as the restatement of the *pratijñā* 'enunciation' in respect of the uniqueness of the Ātman after the *hetu* 'reason' was proved.]

Or rather (we may say), it is intended (by the seer) to begin the subsequent part (of the work) after having first enunciated the uniqueness of the Ātman (or, that all this is but the Ātman) and then stated the reasons for proving what was stated (therein), in order that it should serve as the conclusion.¹ [12]

(Such is the practice that) after having stated various reasons for proving what is enunciated, one states the conclusion (in the form of a restatement) in subsequent statement.¹ [13]

¹This refers to the practice of the commonly used *pañcāvayava-vākya* 'five-membered syllogism'. Read BUB 2.5.1: *tathā hi naiyāyikair uktam hetvapadeśāt pratijñāyāḥ punar-vacanam nigamanam iti*

निदिध्यासनसिद्धयर्थं केचिद्व्याचक्षते परम् ।
 मधुब्राह्मणमेतत्तु न युक्तं प्रतिभाति नः ॥१४॥
 श्रुत आगमतो योऽर्थस्तर्केणापि समर्थितः ।
 स एवार्थस्तु निष्णातो निदिध्यासनमुच्यते ॥१५॥
 शास्त्राचार्यानुभवनैर्हेतुभिश्च समर्थितः ।
 ईदृगैकात्म्यसंबोधो निदिध्यासनमुच्यते ॥१६॥
 निदिध्यासनसिद्धयर्थो यत्नोऽतोऽयमनर्थकः ।
 प्रत्यग्याथात्म्यसंबोधमात्रत्वादेव हेतुतः ॥१७॥

[Ānandagiri reports here as also in ABUB that there now follows a discussion on the view of Bhartr̥.]

Some say¹ that this subsequent section, viz. the section on Madhu, is begun for clarifying the notion of *nididhyāsana*. But this does not appear to us reasonable. [14]

Nididhyāsana is so called when a matter, which is (first) learned from tradition, (later) supported by logic, and then subjected to a deep study.² [15]

Nididhyāsana is so called when, instruction about the uniqueness of the Ātman is justified by (proper) reasons, viz. the Śruti, (instruction of) teachers and (one's own) experience (of the same.)³ [16]

Therefore, this effort (of this section of the Upaniṣad) for showing that (it is intended) to establish *nididhyāsana* (declared by Bharṭṛ) as unnecessary, since the cause of one's (acquisition of) the knowledge of the true nature of the individual consciousness consists only in informing (one about it).⁴ [17]

¹The use of the plural shows the author's respect for Bharṭṛ who holds that verses BU 2.4.1-6 are meant to clarify *śravaṇa*, BU 2.4.7-14, *manana* and BU 2.5, *nididhyāsana*.

²NKL reads *evārthaḥ suniṣṇātaḥ* for *evārthas tu niṣṇātaḥ*. *tu* is understood here in the sense of *ca*. According to NKL, *nididhyāsana* consists in knowing the meaning of the Śruti sentence which results from hearing it and thinking over it and not in meditating on it.

³SP points out that BU 2.4 has explained how *nididhyāsana* consists in the acquisition of *vāk्यārthajñāna*. NKL states that verse 16 explains the purport of *sunīṣṇāta*.

⁴Cf. NKL which informs that *nididhyāsana* is *vāk्यārtha-jñāna* coming from *śravaṇa-manana-phala*.

क्रियाफलोपभोगार्थं सर्वैरेव स्वकर्मभिः ।

जन्तुभिः पृथिवी सृष्टा मधु तेषां ततो मही ॥१८॥

पृथिव्याप्यात्मभोगार्थं सृष्टाः सर्वेऽपि जन्तवः ।

पृथिव्या अपि कार्यत्वान्मधु तेऽपि भवन्त्यतः ॥१९॥

पार्थिवानि शरीराणि सर्वेषां देहिनां यतः ।

पृथिव्या तानि सृष्टानि पृथिव्यन्वयदर्शनात् ॥२०॥

भूतानां च पृथिव्याश्च मिथः कार्यत्वहेतुतः ।

भोग्यभोक्तृत्वसंबन्धस्तस्मात्सिद्धः परस्परम् ॥२१॥

भोग्यता प्रथमान्तेन पृथिव्यादेरिहोच्यते ।

कर्तृता भोक्तृता चैषां षष्ठ्यन्तेनाभिधीयते ॥२२॥

अचेतनांशप्राधान्यात्कार्यकारणतोच्यते ।

भोक्तृभोग्याभिसंबन्धश्चेतनाचेतनात्मनोः ॥२३॥

सर्वेषामपि भूतानां कार्यकारणसंगतेः ।

सर्वभूतात्मकत्वं स्याद्यथा सर्वात्मनस्तथा ॥२४॥

[These verses explain the nature of Madhu as *paraspara-upakārya-upakāraka-bhāva*.]

All beings have created the earth by their own doings¹ for the enjoyment of the fruits of their various activity. Hence the earth is for them Madhu. [18]

The earth also² has created all of the beings for its own enjoyment. Thus, being the product of the earth, they also are Madhu. [19]

Since, the bodies of embodied beings are made of (the stuff of) the earth, therefore, they are (to be taken as) created by the earth;³ we see in them the continued existence of the earth.⁴ [20]

Thus, owing to the reason that the earth and the beings⁵ have a mutual relationship of (cause and) effect, therefore, there is established a mutual relationship of the enjoyer and the enjoyable.⁶ [21]

Here (in the statement, *iyam pṛthivi...*) the character of the enjoyable (and also of the effect)⁷ of *pṛthivi* etc. is expressed with the use (of the noun) with the nominative ending and the character of the cause (or agent) and of the enjoyer of these is expressed (by the noun) with the genitive ending.⁸ [22]

(It is) owing to the predominance of the insentient part that there is the statement of the cause and effect relation and (it is intended to convey that there exists) the relation of the enjoyer and the enjoyable between those that are (of the nature of) the sentient and the insentient.⁹ [23]

(As we can) thus (affirm) on account of the relation of cause and effect which obtains among all beings, they are of the nature of all (beings), in the same way, (we can affirm that) the Ātman (which exists) in all (beings) is (of the nature of them all).¹⁰ [24]

¹*svakarman* refers to the *upakārya-upakāraka* relation which is mentioned earlier.

²SP explains the purpose served by the word *api* which occurs in the verse four times. The first (= the third and the fourth)

api is *upamāvacaka* 'expressive of a simile'. The second *api* stresses that each and every being is included.

³This is parallel to what is stated before; viz. the earth is produced by the beings.

⁴One may remember here: *kāraṇa-dravyam kārye 'vatiṣṭhate*.

⁵*bhūtāni* refers to the existent beings, not the elements.

⁶Sureśvara uses here *bhoktr-bhogyā* in the place of *upakārya-upakāraka*.

⁷*karṭṛtā* in the second line implies *kāryatā* beside *bhogyatā*.

⁸The verse clarifies the mutual relation implied in *bhoktr-bhogyatā* and *karṭṛ-kāryatā*. Such relationships are to be understood in the following verses also.

⁹This verse explains the significance of the two pairs of words that explain the mutual relation between the earth and the beings. This cause and effect relation can obtain between two non-sentients, whereas the enjoyer-enjoyable relation implies the necessity of sentience. Read SP: *pṛthivyāder acetanāmśa-prādhānyāt kāryatvādi-trayam cetanāmśa-prādhānyāc ca bhokṭṛtā*.

¹⁰This is *nigamana* 'conclusion'. The nature of the primordial cause is the nature of all that are effects. The Ātman is the cause of all. Hence, the Ātman is all, i.e. all is nothing else than the Ātman.

संहृत्य स्थूलमाधारं भूतानां च क्षितेस्तथा ।

तदाधेयोपसंहृत्यै यश्चायमिति शब्दयते ॥२५॥

अस्यां पृथिव्यां यश्चासौ भास्वद्विज्ञानविग्रहः ।

अमृतो नित्य एवातो न नाशी स्थूलदेहवत् ॥२६॥

स चापि मधु सर्वेषां भूतानां तानि तस्य च ।

मधु सर्वाणि भूतानि यथा पूर्वमवादिषम् ॥२७॥

सहाध्यात्माधिदैवं हि साधिभूतमिदं जगत् ।

एकैकस्यात्मनः कृत्स्नं भोग्यत्वेनावतिष्ठते ॥२८॥

सर्वः सर्वस्य कार्यं स्यात्सर्वः सर्वस्य भोजकः ।

एवं सति भवेत्सिद्धं यथा पूर्वं प्रपञ्चितम् ॥२९॥

After having thus stated (about) the gross support of beings and also of the earth, (now) is stated (the sen-

tence), *yaś cāyam...* for bringing in (the information about) what is supported in them. [25]

(The one) who is in this earth, possessed of the body (in the form) of lustrous knowledge,¹ is indeed immortal (and) eternal;² therefore, that one is not (at all) perishable like a gross body. [26]

He also is Madhu³ of all beings and all those beings are likewise his Madhu, in the same way as I have already stated.⁴ [27]

Indeed, this whole world, together with the *adhyātma* 'embodied', the *adhidaiva* 'divine' and also the *adhibhūta* 'elemental',⁵ exists for every Ātman (Jīvātman) as its enjoyable.⁶ [28]

All would be the effect of all; all, the enjoyer of all.⁷ This being the case, what is stated herebefore would become justified. [29]

¹*vijñāna* is 'knowledge' associated with the notion of duality. This is so because the individual consciousness (which is, in final analysis, not distinct from the Ātman) is associated with the body and external objects and there thus exists knower-knowable relationship.

²This is to contrast the individual consciousness with the gross body.

³NKL refers this to the notions of *karṭṛ*, *kārya*, *bhokṭṛ* and *bhogyā*.

⁴Stated earlier in verse 22 above.

⁵*adhyātma* is what is associated with the individual consciousness, that is each of the various beings; *adhidaiva*, with each of the divine beings; *adhibhūta*, what is related to each of the elements, i.e. the things.

⁶The idea of the beginningless transmigration of beings in relation to the divine and the elemental world around is the basis of this verse. Consequently, there is reference to many Ātmans, i.e. Jīvātmans. This is similar to the *puruṣabahutva* 'plurality of *puruṣas*' of the Sāṃkhya theory. The concept of the threefold world is held by the Sāṃkhyas: cf. SK 1 and the *Sāṃkhyatattva-kaumudī* and the *Gauḍapādabhāṣya* on the same.

⁷All refers to the transmigratory existence which is in reality the product of ignorance. This has been explained in the earlier

section of this Upaniṣad: cf. *idaṁ sarvaṁ yād ayam ātmā* (BU 2.4.6) as NKL points out.

अध्यात्मं यश्च शारीरः पार्थिवांशसमाश्रयः ।
स चापि मधु सर्वेषां सर्वभूतानि तस्य च ॥३०॥

The embodied one, who is described with reference to (any) embodied (being), and has resorted to the earthly portion, is (likewise) Madhu of all things around him. All (those) things also (are Madhu) of him.¹ [30]

¹This speaks of the Jīvātman and the things around as *upakārya* and *upakārin*, i.e. mutually dependent.

कार्यकारणरूपेण भोज्यभोक्तृतयोदितम् ।
चतुष्टयं पृथिव्यादि तस्य तत्त्वमथोच्यते ॥३१॥
चतुष्टयविभागेन स्वार्थोऽप्यात्मा विभज्यते ।
अविभागोऽपि तादर्थ्याद्भोक्तातः सोऽत्र गृह्यते ॥३२॥

Now is being explained the true nature of the group of the four,¹ beginning with the earth which has been already described (as that which stands) related as mutual cause(s) and the effect(s) and also as being the enjoyer(s) and the enjoyable(s). [31]

In the way of the division of the group of the four, the Ātman also, is being divided, even though it exists for itself. Undivided though he is (as comprising the group of the four),² he is the enjoyer since (the group of the four) exists (solely) for his sake. For this reason, he is understood here (as divided).³ [32]

¹The group of the four comprises of *prthivī*, *ap*, *tejas* and *vāyu*.

²*avibhakto 'pi* implies *vibhaktaḥ*; supply *prthivyādicatuṣṭayarūpeṇa*.

³That is to say: as the *bhoktr* among the four, viz. *kartr*, *kārya*, *bhoktr* and *bhogya*.

प्रत्यक्तया यः प्रथते चतुष्टयविलक्षणः ।
प्रात्यक्ष्यात्सोऽयमित्येवं प्रत्यक्साक्ष्यभिधीयते ॥३३॥

अयमेव स इत्युक्त्वा सामानाधिकरण्यतः ।

प्रत्यङ्मात्रैकयाथात्म्यं चतुर्धोक्तस्य बोध्यते ॥३४॥

पृथिव्यादिषु यः पूर्वं व्याख्यातोऽन्तरबाह्यतः ।

आत्मैव स इति ज्ञेयः तदबोधप्रसूतितः ॥३५॥

अयमित्यस्य शेषः स्याद्योऽयमित्यादिकः परः ।

एवेत्यवधृतावेतत्संसर्गप्रतिषेधकृत् ॥३६॥

तत्त्वं चतुष्टयस्यास्य प्रत्यगात्मैव केवलः ।

अव्यावृत्ताननुगतध्वस्ताविद्यातदुद्भवः ॥३७॥

[Verses 33-37 are *udbhāṣya vyākhyāna*; i.e. they state what is *anukta* in the *bhāṣya* of Śaṅkara, viz. the meaning of *ayam eva saḥ* in BUB; this has a reference to the group of the four *bhoktr* etc.]

He, who is distinct from the group of the four, stands pre-
eminent on account of his being inside (all); (and) on
account of his being directly perceptible, he is described
as the 'inner witness' in the sentence, '*ayam...*' [33]

The Śruti has first made the statement *ayam eva saḥ*; and
now it declares the true nature, viz. the uniqueness of the
individual consciousness even if it is stated as divided into
four¹ by using (the two words *saḥ* and *ayam*) in the same
case. [34]

He who was earlier declared to be the being within and
outside of the (four) beginning with the earth² is (to be
known) as identical with the Ātman; (but he is so descri-
bed there) because of the rise (of the notions) out of ig-
norance about the same (viz. the Ātman).³ [35]

The subsequent (statement) beginning with *yo 'yam*
should be (taken as) a complement of this statement '*ayam*
... (i.e. the statement, *ayam eva saḥ*)'; this word *eva* is for
emphatically asserting and it negates the idea of a contact
(of these, viz. the Ātman⁴ and the group of four.) [36]

The true nature of this group of the four is but (his being)
the unique individual consciousness, which is neither
differentiated (from anything else), nor (lit.) followed by
(i.e. similar to) (anything else) and which has destroyed
ignorance and what has originated from it.⁵ [37]

¹See note 3 on verse 32 above. Alternatively, the individual consciousness can be understood with reference to the embodied beings and divinities and then each of these two kinds of beings can be understood to present the relation of the support and the supported—that makes the division of the individual consciousness into four.

²This description entails the acceptance of duality in that the Ātman is said either to need some support in the body or to be related to it from outside.

³This explains away the contingency of accepting duality.

⁴This explanation is necessitated by a possible doubt that the Ātman and the group of the four are connected like a lotus and its blue (in the statement 'the blue lotus') where 'blue' and 'lotus' are used in the same case (i.e. they have *sāmānādhikaraṇya*).

⁵The four elements, which form a group, are unlike the Ātman, *vyāvṛtta* and *anugata*. Further, they themselves originate from ignorance (about the nature of the individual consciousness); cf. note 3 above.

प्रकृतात्माभिधानं वा स इत्येतत्पदं भवेत् ।
 अयमित्युच्यते साक्षात्संनिकर्षाच्चतुष्टयम् ॥३८॥
 स एवायमिति ज्ञेयो यो द्रष्टव्यतयोदितः ।
 यच्चामृतं स्वभार्यायै याज्ञवल्क्येन भाषितम् ॥३९॥
 ब्रह्मेति ध्वस्तसंभेदं यन्नेतीति पुरोदितम् ।
 सर्वं समभवत्कृत्स्नं यद्याथात्म्यावबोधतः ॥४०॥
 पृथिवीं पार्थिवं चांशं शरीरं साधिदैवतम् ।
 जानीयात्सर्वमात्मेति नेति नेत्युपलक्षणम् ॥४१॥

[This introduces the *ukta* portion of BUB]

Or, the word *saḥ* could be the word that expresses the Ātman (which is) taken up (for discussion).¹ So also the word *ayam* is used for expressing the group of the four on account of its direct contact (with the sense-organs). [38]
 (In the statement) beginning with *sa evāyam* is mentioned the one who is described as one that should be seen and

also whatever is declared by Yājñavalkya to his wife as the immortal.²

[39]

(This group of the four is described) as the Brahman,³ in which (all) difference is destroyed; the one which has been earlier stated (in the sentence) as 'not this, (not this also)'.⁴ All (i.e. this group of the four) has become one whole is a (correct) decision arising from the knowledge of the true nature of the Ātman.⁵

[40]

One should know all⁶ (of) the earth, the earthly portion (in the body) and also the body (of a being) together with their presiding deities, as the Ātman. The words *neti neti* are (but) an indication (of this).⁷

[41]

¹The Ātman has been the subject of discussion from BU 2.4, i.e. the Maitreyī-brāhmaṇa (MaiB); cf. the next verse.

²See *idam amṛtam* (BU 2.5.1); cf. Yājñavalkya's instruction on the doctrine of immortality (of the Ātman) to Maitreyī in BU 2.4.5 ff. And also cf. *etāvad are khalv amṛtatvam* (BU 4.5.15) as NKL points out. The sentences *sa evāyam* here and *ātmā vā are draṣṭavyaḥ* in BU 2.4.5 differ only in words, but they are identical in sense. That is to say: The Ātman is immortal is the *vākyārtha* 'sentence-sense'. Also, 'the group of the four is immortal' can be understood because the four arise from *citsāmānya*.

³Refer to *idam brahma*.

⁴Cf. BU 2.3.6.

⁵Refer to *idam sarvam*; but *tasmāt tat sarvam abhavat* (BU 1.4.10) as NKL points out.

⁶SP points out that all refers to the *adhyātma* and the *adhi-daiva* each of which is twofold, viz. *sthūladvaya* and *sūkṣmadvaya*.

⁷This concludes the explanation of the statements, viz. *idam amṛtam*, *idam brahma* and *idam sarvam*.

उत्तरेष्वपि वाक्येषु योक्तेनैव वर्त्मना ।

इममेव तु वाक्यार्थं व्याचक्षीताविचारयन् ॥४२॥

In respect of the subsequent sentences also should one explain, without entertaining (even a bit of) hesitation (and) in this very manner, that only this is their meaning.¹

[42]

¹BU 2.5.2-10 will describe *ap*, *agni*, *vāyu*, *āditya*, all *diś*, *candra*, *vidyut*, *stanayitnu*, *ākāśa*; these are like the *prthivi* in BU 2.5.1 and therefore, the explanation of 2.5.1 is to be *atidiṣṭa* 'extended' to them.

पृथिव्यादीनि भूतानि तदंशाश्च समीरिताः ।
 हिरण्यगर्भलिङ्गांशास्तथा पूर्वोक्तमूर्तयः ॥४३॥
 यथोक्ता येन सर्वेऽपि प्रयुक्ताः स्वात्मकर्मभिः ।
 उपकुर्वन्ति नः सर्वान्स धर्म इति संज्ञितः ॥४४॥
 तस्य कार्यं द्विधेहोक्तं सामान्यात्मविशेषतः ।
 पृथिव्यादीह सामान्यं विशेषः पिण्डमात्रकम् ॥४५॥
 तत्कार्यस्येह प्रात्यक्ष्यात्तदभेदोपचारतः ।
 प्रत्यक्षवदयं धर्मस्तस्मादेवाभिधीयते ॥४६॥
 साधारणः पृथिव्यादिकारी धर्मोऽभिधीयते ।
 यश्चायमिति वाक्येन तथासाधारणाभिधा ॥४७॥
 यश्चायमध्यात्ममिति योऽयं मद्देहकृन्मतः ।
 साधारणविशेषात्मा यदपूर्वं तदुच्यते ॥४८॥
 प्राजापत्यमपूर्वं यत् सर्वभूतप्रयोजकम् ।
 अध्यात्मं पिण्डकृद्यच्च सोऽयं धर्माभिधोदितः ॥४९॥

(In the same way)¹ the elements earth etc. and their portions, and also the portions of Hiranyagarbha² are declared as the various forms of (the Brahman) already stated. [43]

That has the name *dharma* on account of which (all those fragments of Hiranyagarbha) that are stated before (become) employed (in their respective activities) and become useful to us all on account of their actions.³ [44]

⁴The effect of that (*viz. dharma*) (in the case of each individual being) is, on account of their common characteristic (effect) and the peculiar characteristic (effect) of each,⁵ stated here⁶ to be twofold; thus, here (in respect of *dharma*)⁷ the common (effect) is the earth etc., whereas the peculiar (effect) is just a form (of the earth etc.) [45]

Since the effect of that (*dharma*) is here (i.e. in all dealings) directly perceptible, therefore, just for that (reason), (the phrase) *ayam dharmaḥ* 'this (directly perceptible) *dharma*' is uttered by considering that (*dharma*) in a secondary sense.⁸ [46]

In the statement *yaś cāyam...*, is stated the common property (*dharma*), (viz. that) which produces (the effect, viz.) the earth etc. So also is there a statement of the particular property⁹ [47]

in the words *yaś cāyam adhyātmam....* Thus, the Ātman which is considered as the common and the uncommon property, is the maker of (the notion of) 'my body'. What is *apūrva* is (now) explained. [48]

The activity of Prajāpati (the sacrificer) has no cause (for it) which is the inciter of all beings, and which is, with reference to a (being's) body, the producer of a form. It is this property which is mentioned by the word *dharma*. [49]

¹This understands 'as in verse 42 above'.

²These are the bases or support for the elements; *bhūta-śarīrādhāraḥ* (SP).

³Each portion of Hiraṇyagarbha has its own *karman* 'duty to perform'; *svātmakarman* is *svarūpasadṛśakarman* 'action (prescribed) as particular to one's own nature'. From this verse onwards, the word *dharma* is used in more than one sense. Here, it means duty prescribed for one by the scriptures, and also indicative of its result (something like *punya* or *adṛṣṭa*) ; cf. BU 1.4.14.

⁴Verse 45 answers a possible objection, viz. *dharma* is imperceptible and known only from the Śāstra, that is to say: It is not directly perceptible; as such, the reference to it as *ayam* 'this one' is unreasonable.

⁵The common characteristic activity is their act of offering support to the 'being' within and the peculiar characteristic activity is that which distinguishes itself from that of any other among them. See verses 47-49 below.

⁶I.e. in the Śāstra.

⁷The second *iha* refers to *vyavahāra* 'actual activities' associated with the elements.

⁸*dharma* and *kārya* are described metaphorically as identical and therefore *dharma* is perceptible.

⁹*asādhāraṇa* is the same as *viśeṣa* above; *dharma* here refers to *kriyā* 'activity'.

तथैवाचाररूपेण प्रत्यक्षेण यदीक्ष्यते ।

स एव धर्मः सत्यं स्याद्यद्व्यवस्थाप्रयोजकम् ॥५०॥

साधारणविशेषाभ्यां धर्मवत्तदपि द्विधा ।

साधारणविशेषार्थव्यवस्थाकारणत्वतः ॥५१॥

In the same way, only that, which is directly perceived in the form of some conduct, is *dharma*,¹ the eternal existent, which would cause the regulated order² (of the universe or of beings).

[50]

That (viz. regulator conduct) also is, like *dharma*, twofold, viz. the common and the particular, because of its being the cause of the arrangement of various objects, both common and particular.³

[51]

¹*dharma* is the cosmic Truth which causes/regulates the course of the worldly things.

²*vyavasthā* is *varṇāśramavyavasthā* (SP).

³Cf. *yaś cāyam asmin satye* with reference to the common object and *yaś cāyam adhyātman satyaḥ* the particular.

धर्मसत्यप्रयुक्तोऽयं लिङ्गपिण्डस्वलक्षणः ।

विराड्द्विरण्यगर्भश्च सर्वजातिसमन्वितः ॥५२॥

मनुष्यजातेर्ग्रहणं सर्वजात्युपलक्षणम् ।

इदं मानुषमित्येवं व्याख्या तस्यास्तु पूर्ववत् ॥५३॥

This Immanent Hiranyagarbha,¹ comprising of all (human) species, is (but) effected by *dharma*, the eternal existent, and has its subtle form as its own characteristic.

[52]

In the statement *idam mānuṣam* there is the mention of 'the entire human race' (and it is indicative of all species (in the same)). And² the explanation of that (viz. all species) is like the one given before.³

[53]

¹Cf. note 2 under verses 55-57 below.

²The word *tu* here means *ca*.

³Viz. (in the explanation of) *dharma*. On the previous verse the word *dharmavat* is related to the common characteristic of a certain group of (and also of the particular characteristic of) an individual who is a member of that group and in these verses the word is expressive of the entire group known after its common quality —this last thus refers to *dharmin* instead of *dharma*.

पृथिवी शारीर इत्येवं खण्डशो यः पुरोदितः ।
विराड्द्विरण्यगर्भश्चेत्ययमात्मेति तद्वचः ॥५४॥

[In verse 54, Sureśvara states the general purport of 'BU 2.5.1-13 and its relation to BU 2.5.14.]

That statement *ayam ātmā* is the description of the One who is already described in one section after another, viz. as the earth, the embodied one etc. (and) the Immanent Hiranyagarbha.¹ [54]

¹This is the explanation of the statement *ayam ātmā*. Of course, in earlier text, the sentences *iyam prthivi...* referred to various parts of this whole, i.e. Hiranyagarbha (*avayavin*); cf note under verse 42.

हिरण्यगर्भभेदानां भूतानां च पृथक्पृथक् ।
उक्तं मधुत्वं येनातस्तत्सामस्त्यमथोच्यते ॥५५॥
अयमात्मेति निर्देशो विराजः प्रथमो मतः ।
सप्तम्यन्तेन तत्प्रत्यङ्गलिङ्गात्मास्तोऽभिधीयते ॥५६॥
कार्यात्मा कारणात्मा च यदर्थो भवतः सदा ।
यश्चायमात्मेत्यत्रोक्तो विज्ञानात्मेति यं विदुः ॥५७॥
यस्मिन्नात्मनि विध्वस्तव्याकृताव्याकृतात्मके ।
खिल्यदृष्टान्तवचसा विज्ञानात्मा प्रवेशितः ॥५८॥

Since up to now is stated the character of Madhu in various fragments of Hiranyagarbha and also of elements (in different sub-sections),¹ now is being stated the wholeness of all of them.² [55]

It is held that the first mention³ of the Immanent (Ātman) occurs in the words *āyam ātmā* and, therefore, in the word *ātmani*, which ends with the locative (suffix), is then mentioned the subtle Ātman (residing) in each individual,⁴ [56] and whose meanings are ever the Ātman in the form of the cause and that in the form of the effect, who is mentioned in the words *yaś cāyam ātmā* and (yet) whom they know as an individual knowing Ātman. [57]

⁵In the words conveying the illustration of a lump (of salt), is introduced the individual knowing Ātman (viz. Jīvātman)⁶ as that Ātman (lit. it is made to enter the same), who has the nature of one that is beyond (lit. has destroyed) the manifest and the unmanifest. [58]

¹This refers to *prthivī*, *ap*, *tejas* etc. as the fragments of the Virāj and *śarira*, *caitanya*, *vāṇmaya* etc. of the elements.

²This verse thus introduces the description of the Hiranyagarbha as a whole. He is the first and the subtlest manifestation of the Brahman, when it is somehow and inexplicably affected by Māyā. He is considered to be the first sacrificer, so to say.

³It is doubtful if the word *prathamah* does not stand for *prathamāntah* = *prathamāntam padam* in view of *saptamyantena* which follows.

⁴SP clarifies that this is so because it is later described as *tejomaya* 'full of lustre' etc.

⁵Verse 58 reaffirms that the Immanent Ātman is the Jīvātman.

⁶*Vijñānātman* is Jīva whose knowledge can be described as arising out of subject-object relationship. The word *praveśita* should be understood in the sense of 'made known as identical with'; cf. BU 2.4.12: *sa yathā saindhavakhilya udake prāsta udakam evānuvilīyeta, na hāsyodgrahaṇāyeva syāt...*

ब्रह्मविद्याहतध्वान्ते तस्मिन्ब्रह्मणि निष्ठिते ।

तमस्तदुत्थकार्याणामत्यन्तासंभवादतः ॥५६॥

योऽसावविद्यया देही संसारीवाप्यभूत्पुरा ।

सोऽयं साक्षात्परं ब्रह्म विद्यया वर्ततेऽधुना ॥६०॥

ध्वस्ताज्ञानतदुत्थोऽयं संविन्मात्रसतत्त्वकः ।

अनन्तापार आत्मैव स्वमहिम्नि व्यवस्थितः ॥६१॥

अपूर्वानपरामध्यप्रत्यग्याथात्म्यवित्तये ।

स वा इत्यादिको ग्रन्थः सदृष्टान्तोऽभिधीयते ॥६२॥

ब्रह्मास्मीति परिज्ञानध्वस्तध्वान्तत्वकारणात् ।

राजेति राजनात् भास्वदविप्लुतात्मदर्शनात् ॥६३॥

तथाऽधिपतिशब्देन स्वातन्त्र्यमभिधीयते ।

स्वार्थः प्रत्यक्तदर्थत्वात्सहेतोर्जगदात्मनः ॥६४॥

[Verses 59-64 describe the nature of the Jīvātman and its relation to the Brahman.]

Since there would be utter impossibility (of the existence) of ignorance and its effects, when that (Jīvātman) which has destroyed the darkness (of ignorance) by the knowledge of the Brahman (and has thus) settled in the Brahman. [59]

Now (i.e. when the love of Madhu is obtained), owing to Knowledge, this one, who had formerly become, owing to ignorance, an embodied transmigratory being, as it were, himself is (but) the highest Brahman. [60]

This one whose ignorance and what has arisen from it are destroyed is of the nature of mere sentience (or knowledge),¹ the endless and boundless Ātman existing in his own greatness.² [61]

³The (part of the) work, beginning with *sa vā* is explained together with an illustration in order that one comes to know the true nature of the individual consciousness which does not have any preceding (i.e. origin), any succeeding (i.e. end), and a middle.⁴ [62]

The word *rājā* (is used in the passage) owing to his (newly acquired) shining (i.e. glow), his knowledge (about the Ātman) which is never lost and on account of his complete awareness 'I am Brahman', i.e. because of its having destroyed the darkness (of ignorance). [63]

So also, the word *adhipati* expresses independence (of the Ātman). The individual consciousness (exists) for its own purpose, for the Ātman of the universe (the creator of it), and of its cause (viz. ignorance), exists for it.⁵ [64]

¹The word *satattvaka* literally means 'accompanied by the truth (viz. its nature)' where *satattva* means *svarūpa* ' (its) own nature'.

²Thus is stated that the Jīvātman is but the Ātman, viz. the Brahman, owing to the acquisition of the knowledge of the true nature of the same.

³SP points out that verse 62 refers to the support from a statement in the Śruti for what was described in verse 62, viz. the *vidyāphalabhūta* Ātman, as the sum and substance of verses 58-60.

⁴*apūrvānaparāmadhya* shows the ever-abiding uniform nature of the Ātman. See *tad etad brahmāpūrvam anaparam anantaram abāhyam ayam ātmā brahma* (BU 2.5.19).

⁵Hereby is explained away the possible idea of the fault of *punarukti* 'repetition'. In common parlance, the words *rājan* and *adhipati* are understood as synonyms, but the Upaniṣad uses them with a specific purpose as Śaṅkara points out in BUB 2.5.15 *rājatvaviśeṣaṇam adhipatir iti bhavati kaścid rājocita-vṛttim āśritya rājā, na tv adhipatiḥ, ato viśinaṣṭy adhipatir iti* (p. 354, lines 4-5). This means that the word *rājan* can be associated with the nature of a human being for offering protection to others, being good to them etc., whereas the word *adhipati* expresses his independence. An *adhipati* is a master of himself and does not depend on others while he enters upon any activity. Thus verses 62-63 bring to the fore two aspects of the Ātman, viz. the supreme lustre and absolute independence.

प्रत्यग्विज्ञप्तिमात्रेण समाप्तिं जगदात्मनः ।

आविश्चिकीर्षुः साक्षान्नस्तद्यथेति परा श्रुतिः ॥६५॥

चक्रनाभौ यथा प्रोताश्चक्रनेमौ च बाह्यतः ।

अराः प्राणादयस्तद्वदोताः प्रोताः परात्मनि ॥६६॥

[This is Sureśvara's introductory remark on the illustration.]

The subsequent passage of the Śruti beginning with *tad yathā*, seeks to reveal to us directly the accomplishing of (i.e. becoming one with) the Ātman of the universe by merely giving information about the individual consciousness.¹ [65]

Just as the spokes (of a wheel) are fixed in the hub and also on the (outside) rim, so also are *prāṇa* etc. woven lengthwise and crosswise in the highest Ātman.² [66]

¹This is the purport of the words *tad yathā...* in the Śruti passage.

²This is the paraphrase of the Śruti statement *tad yathā rathanābhu...*

व्याचक्षतेऽन्यथैवेमं दृष्टान्तं केचिदात्मनः ।
 समस्तादिप्रतिज्ञार्थसिद्धये ब्रह्मवादिनः ॥६७॥
 एकीकृत्य स्वमात्मानमक्षरे परमात्मनि ।
 चक्रनाभिवदात्मानं कल्पयित्वा विचक्षणः ॥६८॥
 शरीरं नेमिवच्चैतद्देवताद्यरवज्जगत् ।
 कल्पयित्वा निदिध्यासेत्तद्भूवाविष्टधीः सदा ॥६९॥
 अनेन ध्यानमार्गेण ध्यायमानस्य सर्वदा ।
 तप्तलोहवदेकत्वं भवत्यावृत्तिदुर्लभम् ॥७०॥
 एतामवस्थामापन्नो ध्यातृत्वाद्विनिवर्तते ।
 अविद्यातिमिरान्धानां ध्येयत्वमधिगच्छति ॥७१॥
 निश्चित्याचिन्त्यमेतद्यो योगिनां निलयं परम् ।
 यं प्राप्य न निवर्तन्ते निर्वाणं परमं गताः ॥७२॥
 प्रत्येकं प्राणिनां ह्येतद्ब्रह्मचक्रमवस्थितम् ।
 असंबोधात्तु तैः सर्वैः प्राणिभिर्नानुभूयते ॥७३॥

[Suresvara's discussion of Bhartr's view (introduced in verses 65-66) with the illustration occurs in verses 67-89. Verses 67-73 represent Bhartr's interpretation of the illustration in the preceding verse.]

But some knowers¹ of the Brahman explain this illustration (in respect) of the Ātman² in quite another way, viz. for establishing the meaning of the enunciation beginning with *samasta*.³

[67]

Having fixed one's own self on the imperishable highest Ātman, and having considered the self (in relation to the universe) as the hub of a wheel,

[68]

the body as the rim of the wheel and this universe beginning with the deity as its spokes, the wise one should ever meditate (on the nature of the self) with his intellect fixed on the thought about (its) mode.

[69]

For one who is ever meditating (on the nature of the self) in this way of meditation,⁴ there results oneness (with the highest Ātman) which is similar to one (whole) ball of hot iron and which is difficult (to occur) in transmigration.⁵ [70]

(The wise) one who has attained this state ceases to have the status of a meditator (and), (being one with the Brahman) becomes the object of meditation for those who are blinded by the darkness of ignorance. [71]

He who has (thus) ascertained (for himself the nature of) this unthinkable (Ātman reaches the highest abode of the Yogins), having attained which they do not return (to the transmigratory existence,⁶ (for they) have attained final liberation (lit. extinction of duality).⁷ [72]

Indeed in each of the beings rests (i.e. is present) this wheel of the Brahman (*brahmacakra*), but it (viz. that this is so) is not experienced by all those beings, owing to (their) not knowing of the same.⁸ [73]

¹The reference to Bharṭṛ in the plural shows Sureśvara's (as also Śaṅkara's) respect for him. This interpretation by Bharṭṛ is not found in BUB. Hence it may be said that it is the *anukta* portion in Śaṅkara's comment.

²SP: *dr̥ṣṭānta-grahaṇam dār̥ṣṭāntkopalakṣaṇam* 'The illustrated should be (taken as) implied by the illustration.'

³Upaniṣadic enunciations meant by Bharṭṛ are *idaṁ sarvaṁ yad ayam ātmā* 'All this is what is (called) Ātman', *saprapaṇco 'yam ātmā* 'This Ātman is accompanied by the whole of the universe.'

⁴The use of 'meditation' (*nididhyāsana*, *dhyāna* according to Bharṭṛ) is introduced: Meditation effects oneness of the individual consciousness with the highest Brahman, i.e. it effects the destruction of one's bondage after knowing the true nature of the self.

⁵*āvṛtti-durlabha* is *āvṛttau durlabha*. This means that oneness of the Jīvātman and the Ātman is not experienced by one so long as one is subjected to transmigration.

⁶It appears that there are echos of the thought expressed in BG. See BG 15.6^b: *yad gatvā na na nivartante tad dhāma paramam mama*||

⁷The meditator (*dhyātr*, *yogin*) does meditation (*dhyāna*, *nidī-dhyāṣana*) on *dhyeya* the highest Ātman and having determined the true nature of his own self as identical with the *dhyeya*, attains the highest abode, viz. *para nilaya*, i.e. *parama nirvāṇa*. Thereafter, he no more remains in the condition of a *dhyātr*. He never returns to the status of a *dhyātr*.

⁸This verse offers Bhartr̥'s alternative explanation of the illustration. Further cf. BG 18.61^a: *īśvaraḥ sarva-bhūtānām hṛd-deśe 'rjuna tiṣṭhati*

वैश्वानरवरात्केचिदेवं व्याचक्षते स्फुटम् ।

अक्षरानन्वयात्त्याज्या व्याख्येयं साध्वपीदृशी ॥७४॥

Thus have some very clearly explained (illustration) thanks to the boon of Vaiśvānara.¹ Yet, this (explanation), quite good though it is, has to be rejected,² for want of its proper construe (with the Śruti). [74]

¹We notice that time and again Sureśvara refers to the favour of Agni on Bhartr̥: cf. BUBV 1.4.490; 1.4.1779; 3.2.41; 4.3.1187. Sureśvara seems to suggest that Bhartr̥ derived his knowledge from Agni's favour—it was thus dependent on a deity.

²Sureśvara clearly states his rejection of Bhartr̥'s view.

[Hereafter follows Sureśvara's refutation of Bhartr̥'s view up to verse 89 and in the 90th verse is reaffirmed the view of the Śruti acceptable to him]

सामर्थ्यादपि संप्राप्तो न चेदक्षरपूर्वकः ।

तादृङ्नोपास्य एवेति प्राहुरागमवेदिनः ॥७५॥

प्रमाणवन्त्यदृष्टानि कल्प्यानि सुबहून्यपि ।

अदृष्टशतभागोऽपि न कल्प्यो निष्प्रमाणकः ॥७६॥

यथोक्तचक्रविन्यासो न श्रुतोऽक्षरपूर्वकः ।

न चाप्युपासनपदं कृत्स्नेऽपि ब्राह्मणे श्रुतम् ॥७७॥

नाभिनेमिद्वयस्थाने दृष्टान्तत्वेन संमते ।

दाष्टान्तिकोक्तावात्मैव यतः साक्षादिह श्रुतः ॥७८॥

समर्पितत्वं प्राणादेः श्रूयते प्रत्यगात्मनि ।

भूतेषु देवतादेस्तदश्रुतं गृह्यते कथम् ॥७९॥

बहिरन्तर्विभागोऽस्य कार्यकारणता तथा ।
 तदेतदिति वाक्येन प्रतीचोऽत्रैव वार्यते ॥८०॥
 अथ योऽन्यामिति तथा भेददृष्टिनिराकृतेः ।
 उपास्योपासनविधिर्न सम्यगिति मे मतिः ॥८१॥
 अज्ञानमात्रव्यवधेर्ब्रह्मैकात्म्यफलस्य च ।
 ब्रह्मविद्यातिरेकेण तत्प्राप्तौ नापरा क्रिया ॥८२॥
 यद्वाचानभ्युदितं मनुते मनसा न यत् ।
 तदेव ब्रह्म विद्धि त्वं न त्विदं यदुपासते ॥८३॥
 उपासिक्रियया व्याप्तिरब्रह्मत्वस्य लक्षणम् ।
 श्रुत्याकारि यतस्तादृक्कथं ब्रह्मेत्युपास्यते ॥८४॥
 दृश्यते त्वग्र्यया बुद्ध्या मनसैवेति यद्वचः ।
 तदात्मविद्याविध्यर्थं नोपासनविधायकम् ॥८५॥

Those who have known the (Vedāntic) tradition have declared that (a doctrinal thought)¹, though entertained (lit. obtained) on the basis of the force of the sense (in the illustration² in a passage from the Śruti), should not at all be accepted, if it is not expressed by the Śruti. [75]

One can imagine (that there exist) quite good many things which, though not known (lit. perceptible), have authoritative proof for establishing their existence. However, not even a hundredth part or fraction of some unknown (lit. unseen thing) should be entertained (lit. imagined), if it has no (such) authoritative proof.³ [76]

The (introduction of the) idea of the cycle (of the Brahman by Bharṭṛ) is not heard as enunciated first by the Śruti.⁴ So also not (a word) is heard about meditation⁵ in the whole of this section (of the Upaniṣad, i.e. BU 2.5). [77]

The two distinct places, viz. the hub and the rim, are accepted (by the Śruti merely) as an illustration; however, in the place of the illustrated is here heard only the (unique) Ātman.⁶ [78]

The merger of *prāṇa* etc.⁷ in the individual consciousness is (directly) heard (in the Śruti). How can one accept

the merger of the deity etc. in the elements, (which is) not heard in the Śruti?⁸ [79]

Such division as the exterior and the interior, and also the nature of being (related as) the cause and the effect is just here set aside (viz. rejected) with reference to this individual consciousness in the sentence *tade tat*.⁹ [80]

And also on account of the rejection of the notion of the existence of discrete objects, in the Śruti sentence *atha yo 'nyām*,¹⁰ I think that (accepting) an injunction regarding meditation¹¹ on an object of meditation is not proper.¹² [81]

Further, beside (acquiring) the knowledge of the Brahman,¹³ there is no other activity (to be undertaken) for attaining the Brahman, since there is only one obstacle, viz. that of ignorance, to the acquisition of the fruit, viz. the unity (or uniqueness) of the Brahman.¹⁴ [82]

Know (you) this: That, which is not expressed by speech and which one does not ponder over with *manas*, is the Brahman, but not this which they meditate on.¹⁵ [83]

The definition of what is not the Brahman is (that) it is obtained (lit. limited or covered) by an act of meditation. Hence how can that which (one thinks as) similar to that¹⁶ (viz. *abrahman* 'the non-Brahman') be meditated on as the Brahman? [84]

The statement (in the Śruti) *drśyate tv agryayā buddhyā manasaiva*¹⁷ is for laying down the knowing of the Ātman, but not injunctive of any meditation. [85]

¹*artha* is explained in SP as *dr̥ṣṭānta-sāmarthyāt tvadiṣṭo 'rthaḥ*; so also in NKL.

²*sāmarthya*: The determinant of the meaning is the force of the illustration in the passage, as can be interpreted by someone. That is to say: The interpretation of an illustration should be in keeping with what is expressly stated in the Śruti; it should not arise from one's imagination.

³Sureśvara suggests that it is only the play of imagination that works while Bharṭṛ posited his views on the *dr̥ṣṭānta* under discussion and no authoritative proof of the Śruti has led him to do so. For Sureśvara (and also for others), the Śruti is the

ultimate decisive proof. Also cf. NKL: *evenividhasyārthasya śrutatvāt na kalpakāpekṣā*.

⁴That is to say: It is not supported by the Śruti.

⁵There is not a single word expressive of *nididhyāsana* as understood by Bhartr̥.

⁶See Introduction pp. xvii-xx on the illustration of *rathanābhi*, *rathanemi* and *rathacakra*.

⁷These are *prāṇādayaḥ* mentioned in BU 1.4; or the sense-organs as mentioned in the Upaniṣad pertaining to what happened at the time of death. See CU 6.8.6 and 6.15.2.

⁸Sureśvara has already explained Bhartr̥'s idea of the *brahmacakra* in verses 68-69. Now he raises here objection to the idea contained in verse 69. True, Bhartr̥ has explained the illustration logically, but he does not have any Śruti for support! He imagines those things which are not mentioned in the Śruti.

⁹The Śruti *tad etat* is *tad etad brahmāpūrvam anaparam anantaram abāhyam ayam ātmā brahma sarvānubhūḥ*; cf. NKL-footnote. The reference in Bhartr̥'s explanation to the exterior and the interior is not supported by the Śruti.

¹⁰BU 1.4.10: *atha yo 'nyām devatām upāste...*

¹¹According to Bhartr̥, the root *upās-* in BU 1.4.10 has the sense of the root *dhyai* (from which come *dhyāna* and *nididhyāsana*) and, therefore, there is an injunction regarding meditation.

¹²Refer to SP: *na hi bhedaṁ vinopāsyādi-prakārasambhavaḥ prakṛte ca bheda-dr̥ṣṭir apodyate tan nātropāsti-vidhir ity arthaḥ*. Any meditation presupposes duality, viz. the subject and the object of meditation. Since the Upaniṣad under discussion clearly sets aside the notion of duality, any meditation is altogether impossible.

¹³This is in reality no activity, for it means only the removal of ignorance.

¹⁴Knowledge of the Brahman is, though the result, not the fruit of any activity. NKL reads *brahmātmaikya* for *brahmaikātmya* and that would mean 'oneness of the Brahman and Jīva'.

¹⁵Time and again Sureśvara refers to different Śrutis in order to lend support for his view. Here, the first *pāda* 'quarter' of the verse is identical with KenaU 1.5 (its first *pāda*), the second *pāda* compares with KenaU 1.6 (the first *pāda*), viz. *yan manasā na manute*, and the third and the fourth *pādas* (i.e. the second

line) are similar to KenaU 1.5-9 (the second line of each), viz. *tad eva brahma tvam viddhi nedam yad idam upāsate*. This precludes the idea of any *upāsana* (or *nididhyāsana*—cf. note 5 above).

¹⁶'That' in 'similar to that' means what is obtained (lit. limited or covered) by an act of meditation.

¹⁷This is similar to KaṭhU 3.12 (the second line): *drśyate tv agryayā buddhyā sūkṣmayā sūkṣma-darsibhiḥ*.

रजस्तमोनुविद्धेन यतो न ब्रह्म गम्यते ।

शुद्धचेतस्तया तस्माद्विद्याद्ब्रह्मान्तरात्मनि ॥८६॥

यद्वानात्माभिसंबन्धात्पूर्वमैकात्म्यनिष्ठता ।

सर्वप्राणभृतां बुद्धिरित्यर्थो वचसो भवेत् ॥८७॥

[This as well as the following verse are meant for the interpretation of the Śruti quoted in the preceding verse]

Since the Brahman is not understood by one who is overcome by *rajas* and *tamas*; therefore, one should know the Brahman within one's (*own*) consciousness, being possessed of purified intellect.¹ [86]

Or rather, the meaning of the Śruti (passage) could be that before there occurred their association with the non-Ātman, the intellect of all human beings² rested in the uniqueness (of the Ātman).³ [87]

¹The word *śuddha-cetas* means *śuddha-citta*. This *citta* does not belong to *buddhi* part but it belongs to the individual consciousness which is held to be participating in any knowledge situation. And this *citta*, individual consciousness, is identical with the body itself and brings about a favourable situation for the knowing mechanism.

²The word *prāṇa-bhṛt* signifies literally one who bears, i.e. possessed of, *prāṇa*, i.e. a living being. Yet because of the reference to *buddhi* 'intellect', it is proper to translate it as a human being.

³cf. *brahmaikātmya* in verse 82 above; NKL explains *aikātmya* as *cidākāratā*.

एषोऽर्थो वचसस्तस्य न तूपासाविधिर्भवेत् ।
प्रध्वस्तभेद ऐकात्म्ये नोपासनविधिर्यतः ॥८८॥

This is the meaning of that statement; it could not indeed be any injunction for meditation,¹ since there would not be any injunction for meditation in the case of the uniqueness of the Ātman, wherein the existence of discrete objects is completely destroyed. [88]

¹This refers to *yadvānātmābhisambandhāt* (*upāsāvidhiḥ*) in the preceding verse. The purpose of this verse is to preclude the possibility of assuming that there is scope for an injunction with regard to meditation.

चक्रवृत्तिरतोऽसाध्वी श्रुत्यादिमितिबाह्यतः ।
तदेतदिति वाक्यार्थो ग्राह्योऽतः संभवान्मितेः ॥८९॥

[Here is concluded Sureśvara's refutation of Bhartr's interpretation of the illustration.]

Hence the notion of the cycle (of the Brahman) is not reasonable for the reason that it is outside (the ways of right) knowing, viz. *śruti* etc.¹ The meaning of the sentence *tad etat...*² should therefore be acceptable owing to the possibility of right knowing. [89]

¹Read BUBV 2.4.214: *śruti-liṅgādiko nyāyaḥ śabdaśakti-vivekakṛt/ āgamārtha-viniścityai mantavya iti bhanyate*|| On this, see Hino (1982), pp. 177-178. Also cf. *Arthasaṃgraha* (p. 12): *etasya vidheḥ sahakāri-bhūtāni ṣaṭ pramāṇāni śrutiliṅga-vākya-prakarāṇa-sthāna-samākhyā-rūpāṇi*.

²BU 2.5.19: *tad etad brahma apūrvam anāparam anantaram abhāhyam...*

तदाहुरिति वाक्येन ब्रह्मविद्याप्रयोजनम् ।
साक्षेपं प्रागुपन्यस्तं तस्यायं निर्णयः कृतः ॥९०॥

In the passage beginning with *tad āhur*, 'Now, they

declare',¹ there is first stated the purpose of the knowledge of the Brahman, together with the objection to it, and this is the decision given in respect of that (viz. the sentence of the Śruti). [90]

¹BU 1.4.9: *tad āhur yad brahma-vidyayā sarvaṃ bhaviṣyanto manyasyā manyante kim u tad brahmāved yasmāt tat sarvaṃ abhavad iti*

आत्मेत्येवेति सूत्रस्य व्याख्येयं सम्यगात्मनः ।

पञ्चभिर्ब्राह्मणैः श्रुत्याकारि कृत्स्नात्मबुद्धये ॥६१॥

समाप्ता ब्रह्मविद्येयं कैवल्यावाप्तयेऽखिला ।

यामवोचत्स्वभार्यायै याज्ञवल्क्योऽतिविस्तरात् ॥६२॥

Thus has the Śruti offered, in its five sections,¹ the explanation² of (or exposition on) the fundamental proposition 'only as the Ātman'³ for the complete knowledge of the Ātman. [91]

Thus is completed (the instruction on) the lore of the Brahman,⁴ for attaining the state of the Absolute, (the one) which Yājñavalkya imparted to his wife, at (sufficient) length. [92]

¹I.e. BU 2.1-5.

²Here the word *vyākhyā* does not mean 'definition'; it means 'exposition'.

³The so called (*vidyā*)*sūtra* 'fundamental proposition' is *ātmety evopāsita* (BU 1.4.7).

⁴The purpose of this verse is to state that the complete exposition of the fundamental proposition given so far is also the exposition of the lore of the Brahman. The two are in no way different.

यथोक्तब्रह्मविद्याया इत आरभ्य भण्यते ।

आख्यायिकेयं स्तुत्यर्था प्रवृत्त्यङ्गतया परा ॥६३॥

आख्यायिकार्थं मन्त्राभ्यां व्याचष्टे श्रुतिरादरात् ।

श्रुतिमन्त्रस्तुतो ह्यर्थ आदेयत्वं निगच्छति ॥६४॥

[These verses are the link between the discussion so far on the knowledge of the Brahman and BU 2.5.16 and 17: They say that two *mantras* quoted in BU 2.5.16 and 17 have the same purpose, viz. imparting instruction about the knowledge of the Brahman.]

(Now) from this (ensuing) passage begins the narrative in praise of the lore of the Brahman (which is) thus discussed (above), as subservient to (securing one's) inclination (to proceed to the study of the lore).¹ [93]

The Śruti has with great care (lit. respectfully) explained the meaning of the narrative in two *mantras*,² because a meaning (i.e. doctrine) which is presented (lit. praised) by the *mantras* of the Śruti possesses (lit. comes to have) acceptability. [94]

¹That is to say: The narrative in BU 2.5.16-17 is purposeful like an Arthavāda.

²The word *mantra* means 'verse from a Vedic Saṁhitā, (such as the *R̥gvedasaṁhitā*, the *Yajurvedasaṁhitā* etc.) The *mantras*, the prose of the Brāhmaṇa and the Upaniṣadic passages are all called Śruti. Yet, *mantra* is supposed to be the greatest authority.

[Now follows a discussion on Madhuvidyā in the light of the narrative of the Aśvins' securing the knowledge of Madhuvidyā and also of two other Vedic verses.]

अवाप्तपुरुषार्थोऽपि यामरक्षच्छचीपतिः ।
 प्रत्यग्विद्यैव तेन स्यादुदारफलसाधनम् ॥६५॥
 महता च यतोऽश्विभ्यामायासेनार्जिता पुरा ।
 ब्रह्मविद्या ततो नास्या मुक्तौ स्यात्साधनं परम् ॥६६॥
 निःशेषपुरुषार्थानां कैवल्योत्तमता यथा ।
 साधनानामपि तथा तद्विद्योत्तमसाधनम् ॥६७॥
 अश्व्याथर्वणयोर्वृत्तं ब्रह्मविद्याप्तिकारणात् ।
 यत्प्रागाविष्कृतिस्तस्य मन्त्राभ्यां क्रियतेऽञ्जसा ॥६८॥

[These verses give the meaning of the two *mantras* quoted in BU 2.5.16 and 17.]

The knowledge of (the nature of) the individual consciousness, which the lord of Śacī (viz. Indra) guarded (i.e. kept from others), even though he had obtained his end of life (viz. god-head in heaven)¹; hence, it would be a means to the acquisition of (the most) profuse fruit (viz. liberation). [95]

And since that knowledge of the Brahman was formerly (i.e. in the ancient times) obtained by the two Aśvins with great efforts,² therefore, there could not be any greater means to liberation (than that knowledge). [96]

As the greatest excellence abides in liberation amongst all the ends of human life, among all the means (to liberation), the best means is the (acquisition of the) knowledge of the Brahman. [97]

Whatever transpired between the Aśvins and Ātharvaṇa in respect of (the Aśvins') obtaining the knowledge of the Brahman is first made known by two *mantras* (of Rv) in a clear way. [98]

¹Sureśvara bases his verse on the Purāṇic notion that attaining the status of Indra was the highest fruit of sacrificial activity and the highest goal of human life. Even then, he did not part with Madhuvidyā. This shows how much (more) precious is the knowledge of the Brahman.

²This has a reference to ŚatBr 14.1.1-2 where the ritual of Pravargya is discussed. The Aśvins are said to have obtained knowledge of that ritual which made the imperfect sacrifice perfect. Thereby they attained a share of Soma at that ritual. This refers to the *tvāṣṭra madhu* mentioned in verse 114 below.

अश्विभ्यां प्रार्थितोऽथर्वा मधुविद्यामिमां किल ।
तावथर्वाब्रवीदिन्द्रश्छिन्द्यान्मे ब्रुवतः शिरः ॥६६॥
अतो भयादिमां विद्यां युवाभ्यां न ब्रवीम्यहम् ।
तमूचतुः पुरैवावामिन्द्रच्छेदनतः शिरः ॥१००॥

छित्त्वा तवाश्व्यं सन्धाय शिरः श्रोष्यावहे ततः ।
 ब्रूह्यतोऽश्व्येन शिरसा मधुविद्यां विमुक्तये ॥१०१॥
 एवमस्त्वित्यनुज्ञाते छित्त्वा तस्याथ तच्छिरः ।
 समधत्तां शिरोऽश्वस्य तेन विद्यामुवाच सः ॥१०२॥
 पुनश्छिन्नेऽथ शिरसि तेनेन्द्रेणाश्विनावपि ।
 समधत्तां शिरस्तस्य विद्यां स्वशिरसाथ सः ॥१०३॥
 शेषामवोचदश्विभ्यामृतायन्नात्मनो वचः ।
 यत एवमतस्तस्मात्सत्यं रक्ष्यं प्रयत्नतः ॥१०४॥

[The narrative of the Aśvins and Ātharvaṇa is given here in brief.]

It is said that Atharvan (i.e. Ātharvaṇa) was requested by the Aśvins (to impart to them) this knowledge of Madhu. To them he said, "Indra would cut off my head if (lit. while) I talked. [99]

"Hence, out of fear (for him), I do not disclose (lit. declare) this lore to you two." The two (Aśvins then) said to him, "Even before your head is cut off by Indra, [100]

we shall have cut your head and fixed (on your shoulders) a horse-head; then shall we hear (the knowledge of Madhu) from that (head). Disclose (lit. declare) the lore of Madhu with that horse-head, so that (we can attain) liberation." [101]

When he consented (in the words), "Be it so", they cut off his head and fixed a horse-head (on his body). By that (horse-head) he then declared (to them) the lore (of Madhu). [102]

Then, after that (horse)-head was cut off by Indra, the two Aśvins also restored his own head (to his body). Then, with his own head, he — [103]

declared to the Aśvins the remaining part (of the lore of Madhu), (thus) wishing to follow *rta* (i.e. fulfilling his agreement).¹ Since this is so, therefore should one maintain (lit. protect) Truth with all (of one's) efforts. [104]

¹*ṛtāyat* (Vedic adj.) wishing to acquire, i.e. follow, *rta*

‘the eternal order (of things)’ which comprises the ever obtaining Truth. This justifies the words *satyaṁ rakṣyam prayatnataḥ. ṛta* of Vedic times paved away to the concept of *satya* ‘verifiable truth’.

इदं वै तन्मधु प्रोक्तं यत्तत्प्रकरणान्तरे ।
 दध्यङ् ह वा आभ्यामिति श्रूयते ब्राह्मणोक्तिः ॥१०५॥
 मधुब्राह्मणमेतत्तद्यत्प्रागुक्तमभूत्स्फुटम् ।
 दध्यङ्ङाथर्वणोऽश्विभ्यां यदुवाचात्मबोधनम् ॥१०६॥
 अश्व्याथर्वणयोरेतत्कर्म पश्यन्नृचाब्रवीत् ।
 ऋषिरार्षेयदृष्टचैव तदेतदभिधीयते । १०७॥

This is indeed that Madhu, which was declared in another context (i.e. the book of this text),¹ for it is heard from the Brāhmaṇa (i.e. in a statement in it),² “Indeed, to these two Dadhyañc Ātharvaṇa...” [105]

This is that (known) section on Madhu which was earlier fully (or clearly) explained, (the one) which Dadhyañc the son of Atharvaṇa, declared to the Aśvins, revealing (as it does, the nature of) the Ātman. [106]

Seeing with a seer’s eye this doing of the Aśvins and Ātharvaṇa, the seer spoke (about it) in a *ṛk*. It is declared (thus) here. [107]

¹In the context of the Pravargya rite, in the earlier section of ŚatBr. *prokta* is paraphrased by NKL as *sūcita*. This indicates the unity of thought in ŚatBr 14.1.1-2 and BU 2.5.16.

²The quotation *dadhyañ ha vā ābhyām* is from ŚatBr 14.1.1; it is earlier referred to in Rv 1.116.12.

आविष्करोमि तत्कर्म युवयोरद्य हे नरौ ।
 लाभाय सनये क्रूरं चक्रथुर्यद्रहस्यगौ ॥१०८॥
 वृष्टेरागमनं यद्वत्स्तनयित्नुः प्रबोधयेत् ।
 रहस्यं युवयोः कर्म तद्वदाविष्करोम्यहम् ॥१०९॥
 अश्वस्य शिरसा वां यदवोचन्मध्वसावृषिः ।
 दधीचोऽश्व्यं शिरश्छित्त्वा निकृत्यास्य शिरोऽश्विनौ ॥११०॥

संधत्तां सोऽश्वशिरसा युवाभ्यां मध्वथाब्रवीत् ।
 ऋतायन्सत्यमात्मानं कर्तुमिच्छन्नसावृषिः ॥१११॥
 प्राणसंशयमापन्नस्तस्माच्चैवावसीयते ।
 आत्मनो मरणेनापि सत्यं रक्ष्यं प्रयत्नतः ॥११२॥

[In the preceding verses, Sureśvara gave a summary of the contents of the *mantras* in Rv 1.116.12 (accents are not shown here): *tad vām narā sanaye daṁsa ugram āviṣkṛṇomi tanyatur na vṛṣṭim| dadhyañ ha yan madhv ātharvaṇo vām aśvasya śirṣṇā pra yad im uvāca|| atharvaṇāyāśvinā dadhice 'śvyamṁ praty airayatam*. Now he gives a philosophical exposition of the same]

That mighty deed of you two, which you did for a gain, do I proclaim (lit. reveal) today, O heroes, O knowers of (the) secret. [108]

As the cloud would make known (i.e. proclaim) the coming of showers, so do I reveal (that) secret¹ deed of yours, [109]

viz. that the seer declared to you, the (lore of) Madhu; that you had cut the horse-head of Dadhyañc after you had (earlier) cut off his own head, and O Aśvins, [110]

you had fixed a horse-head on him, and then, that seer revealed (lit. declared) to you that (lore of) Madhu, seeking the *ṛta*² i.e. wishing to prove himself truthful; [111]

and thus he had fallen in danger of life.³ And from that itself is it decided (lit. concluded) that truth should be maintained (lit. protected) by one with all efforts, even at the cost of one's life. [112]

¹Meaning 'not to be known to common people'.

²*ṛta* (in Veda) means the established truth and *satya*, the verifiable truth. See Velankār, "Ṛta and satya in the Ṛgveda" pp. 3-6.

³Sureśvara's exposition well compares with a narrative composition.

⁴The use of the word *ātman* in the sense of 'life' is to be noted.

आदित्यविषयं त्वाष्ट्रं मध्वोचदथर्वणः ।

हे दस्रावपि कक्ष्यं यत्प्रत्यग्याथात्म्यदर्शनम् ॥११३॥

उपक्षयकरौ व्याधेर्दस्रौ स्यातामतोऽश्विनौ ।

न केवलं त्वाष्ट्रमेव कक्ष्यमप्यब्रवीन्मधु ॥११४॥

[Here is given an explanation of the words *tvāṣṭra* and *dasra* in the R̥gvedic verses.]

¹Atharvaṇa (i.e. Ātharvaṇa) declared the Madhu of Tvaṣṭṛ, having the Sun (viz. Āditya) as its object, “O wondrous,² (it revealed) even the secret (lore),³ the knowledge of the true nature of the individual consciousness.⁴

[113]

Hence are the Aśvins declared *dasrau*, viz. those who cause destruction (of malady). (As such, it is no wonder that) not only did (Ātharvaṇa) declare (the) Madhu of Tvaṣṭṛ but also that which was to be kept hidden under the armpit.⁵

[114]

¹This is the explanation of Rv 1.117.22: ...*tvāṣṭram yad dasrau apikakṣyam vām*.

²*dasrā* = *dasrau* (Vedic dual) is the most usual epithet of the Aśvins who are known for their performance of wonderful deeds.

³The word *kakṣya* means ‘secret’; literally ‘kept hidden under one’s armpit’—this follows the reading in Rv. It is apparent that Sureśvara reads *api* as a separate word. This is against the Vedic tradition! He takes *kakṣya* as secret and *api* as *ca*. See next verse also.

⁴*pratyagātman* is light itself.

⁵The first line explains the significance of the epithet *dasrau* and the second line, of the word *api*. Thus, BU has made a change in the R̥gvedic idea wherein *madhu* is understood to be twofold: That which is related to Tvaṣṭṛ and that which is to be kept as secret—one in ritual contexts, the other in philosophical.

प्रवर्ग्याध्याययोरेवं त्वाष्ट्रज्ञानोपसंहृतम् ।

मन्त्रद्वयेन कृत्वाथ कक्ष्यज्ञानोपसंहृतिः ॥११५॥

क्रियतेऽध्याययोरेवं मधुकाण्डं समाप्यते ।

श्रुतिमन्त्रोपदिष्टोऽर्थो यस्मादाद्रियते ततः ॥११६॥

[Concluding remark on the Aśvin-legend]

Thus, having put in two *mantras* the knowledge about (the secret of) Tvaṣṭṛ (which was earlier) imparted in the two chapters on Pravargya¹ is now concluded (i.e. brought out) the secret knowledge (lit. that which is to be kept hidden under the armpit) in these two chapters. [115]

And thus² is concluded the Madhukāṇḍa, because the thought which was given by the *mantras* in the Śruti is to be respected. [116]

¹Cf. ŚatBr 14.1.1-2

²*tvāṣṭra-jñāna* leads to *kakṣya-jñāna*; there is now a shift from ritual to philosophy.

पुरश्चक्रे शरीराणि द्विपदः पक्षिमानुषान् ।

चतुष्पदोऽथ पशवः पुरश्चक्रे स्वमायया ॥११७॥

पुरो भुक्तशरीरात्स पक्षी लिङ्गमिहोच्यते ।

पुरो नवशरीराणि प्राविशज्जलचन्द्रवत् ॥११८॥

[These verses explain BU 2.5.18: *puraś cakre dvipadaḥ puraś cakre catuṣpadaḥ/ puraḥ sa pakṣi bhūtvā paraḥ puruṣa āviśat/*]

First he made cities, i.e. bodies, the bipeds, viz. the birds and the human beings, then he made the four-footed animals, by his own powers. [117]

From the city, i.e. the body which was enjoyed (by him earlier); the bird is (the one which is) an indication;¹ (thus is it stated here.) He entered into new bodies, like the moon, into watery places.² [118]

¹The bird flies from one perch to another, likewise the Ātman moves from one body to another; this is transmigration of the Ātman during the continuance of ignorance. And entering into

the body requires 'subtleness' which is also indicated by the 'bird'.

²While introducing this verse, BU has stated that it has the same significance as the Aśvin-legend. That is to say: Madhu is the all-pervasive character of the Ātman.

कस्मात्पुरुष इति चेत्पुरुषार्थं श्रुतिः स्वयम् ।
स वा इत्यादिनाचष्टे सर्वैकात्म्यावबुद्धये ॥११६॥
पुरुषोऽयं भवेदात्मा यतः शेते स पुरुषु ।
सर्वासु तेन लोकेऽस्मिन्पुरुषोऽयमितीर्यते ॥१२०॥

[Here is an incidental explanation of the word *puruṣa* in BU 2.5.18.]

If one were to ask 'why is that one called Puruṣa?', the Śruti itself declared the meaning of the Puruṣa in the passage beginning with *sa vā* so that there arises the understanding that all is but the uniqueness of the Ātman. [119]
The Ātman is Puruṣa because he resides in all (the bodies).
Hence, he is described in this world, (as) 'This is Puruṣa.'¹ [120]

¹This is an etymological meaning of the word *puruṣa*. It is a characteristic method of Brāhmaṇas for explaining various names of the rites. See BU 2.5.18: *sa vā ayam puruṣaḥ sarvāsu pūrṣu puriśayaḥ.*

परिच्छेदप्रसङ्गश्चेन्मैवं यस्मादिदं जगत् ।
नैनैनानावृतं किञ्चिन्नाव्याप्तं ह्योततन्तुवत् ॥१२१॥
नासंवृतं तथा किञ्चित्प्रोततन्तुवदात्मना ।
पूर्णत्वात्पुरुषः सोऽयं ब्रह्मैकं पुरुषस्ततः ॥१२२॥

If (one were to say) that this (definition of Puruṣa) involves the contingency of (accepting) limitation (on the Puruṣa in respect of uniqueness)¹ (then our reply is): do not say so, since it is not that, not even a little of this universe is not covered by this one and also not pervaded (by this one) like a lengthwise woven thread.² [121]

So also there is not anything that is not wrapped by this Ātman like a breadthwise woven thread. He is the Puruṣa because of his fullness and, therefore, this Puruṣa is the unique Brahman.³

[122]

¹Because of *puri śete* one can postulate the idea of duality.

²Read BU 2.5.18: *nainena kiṃcanānāvṛtam nainena kiṃcanāsamvṛtam*.

³See verse 66 above; two similes in these two verses refer to the *otaprotatva* of the universe effected by the Brahman in BU.

यस्मात्परं नापरमस्ति किञ्चि-

द्यस्मान्नाणीयो न ज्यायोऽस्ति कश्चित् ।

वृक्ष इव स्तब्धो दिवि तिष्ठत्येक-

स्तेनेदं पूर्णं पुरुषेण सर्वम् ॥१२३॥

आवृतं ज्ञप्तिमात्रेण सर्वमात्मीकृतं जगत् ।

संवृतं प्रतिषिद्धं तद्यदनात्मेव लक्ष्यते ॥१२४॥

तन्नास्ति कारणं कार्यं यन्नानेनात्मसात्कृतम् ।

तन्नास्ति कारणं कार्यं यन्नानेनात्मना ह्नुतम् ॥१२५॥

[These verses re-affirm that the Puruṣa is the same as the Ātman.]

All this is pervaded (lit. filled) by that Puruṣa in comparison with whom there is nothing higher or lower, than whom not any other¹ is smaller or greater, and who stands alone like a huge tree steady in the sky.²

[123]

(This) whole universe which is ascertained as the Ātman is pervaded by Knowledge alone. All that is wrapped (i.e. limited or covered by ignorance) is rejected (i.e. not understood as the Ātman); (it is) what is characterized like some non-Ātman.³

[124]

There is not a cause or an effect which is not included in itself by the Ātman. (And also) there is no such cause or effect as is not covered by the Ātman.⁴

[125]

¹This description of the Puruṣa is thus that of the Brahman. This leaves no scope for any notion of duality.

²Sureśvara cites this verse from the *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* viz. 3.9.

³The first line explains what is meant in verse 121 and the second, verse 122. The words *āvrta* 'covered' and *saṁvrta* 'limited' frequently occur in GK.

⁴The verse expresses the thought of the preceding verse, but by the *vyatireka* method; cf. Hino (1982), p. 47 ff. on *anvayavyatireka* method.

रूपं रूपं प्रति ह्येष प्रतिरूपो बभूव ह ।
 देहं देहं प्रविष्टः संस्तद्देहाकारतामगात् ॥१२६॥
 मायाभिः प्रत्यगज्ञानैर्यदि वानृतबुद्धिभिः ।
 गम्यते पुरुरूपोऽज्ञैरेकोऽपि जलसूर्यवत् ॥१२७॥
 प्रत्यग्याथात्म्यबोधार्थं रूपं मायामयं विभोः ।
 शास्त्राचार्यादिना नर्ते ज्ञातुं वस्त्वह शक्यते ॥१२८॥
 कुतोऽस्य बहुरूपत्वमिति हेतुरिहोच्यते ।
 युक्ता ह्यस्येति वचसा मिथ्याज्ञानैकहेतुतः ॥१२९॥
 स्रजस्तत्त्वापरिज्ञानाद्युक्ता दण्डादयो यथा ।
 प्रत्यक्तत्त्वापरिज्ञानादात्मनो हरयस्तथा ॥१३०॥
 इन्द्रियाण्येव हरयो हरणाद्विषयान्प्रति ।
 दश तानि सहस्राणि शतानि प्राणिभेदतः ॥१३१॥

[These verses explain BU 2.5.19 which is originally an exposition on Rv 6.47.18: *rūpaṁ rūpaṁ pratirūpo babhūva tad asya rūpaṁ praticakṣaṇāya/ indro māyābhiḥ pururūpa iryate yuktā hy asya harayaḥ śatā daśa*]]

Indeed¹ did he become a counter-form for each and every form. Having entered into each body, he is reported to have¹ attained the shape of that body.² [126]

On account of his powers, i.e. various types of ignorance about the true nature of the individual consciousness (or owing to false knowledge), is this one, though unique (i.e. one without a second) is understood as being possessed of many forms like the sun (which seems to be many) in watery places.³ [127]

It is not possible in this universe⁴ to know Reality, viz. the form of the all-pervading (Ātman) which is possessed of many powers,⁵ without (the help of) the Śruti and teachers etc., in order that one can understand the true nature of the individual consciousness.⁶ [128]

If one asked the question, 'How can this one have many forms?', the reason (for saying so) is stated here⁷ by the statement, *yuktā hy asya...*, to say (that 'this is so) on account of its originating from false knowledge alone.' [129]

As (the apprehension of) a stick etc. is, on account of non-grasping the truth about the wreath (etc.),⁸ considered as right knowledge, so also are the sense-organs⁹ supposed to be related to the Ātman because of the non-knowing about the true nature of the individual consciousness. [130]

On account of their carrying away (the Ātman) to the objects (of worldly experience) the sense-organs are called horses;¹⁰ they are ten, a thousand, a hundred, according as they are grasped¹¹ as discrete beings.¹² [131]

¹This is owing to the use of *ha* in the verse. The two particles *hi* and *ha* emphasise the popular experience of duality.

²This is the meaning of *rūpaṁ rūpaṁ pratirūpo babhūva tad asya rūpaṁ praticakṣaṇāya*.

³This sets aside the possible notion that the manifold forms of the Ātman have a material or an efficient cause.

⁴*iha* refers to transmigratory existence.

⁵It should be observed that this verse also is taken by BU to convey the idea of Madhu as the all-pervading character of the Ātman that is noticed in the Aśvin-legend.

⁶These two verses interpret the second line: *indro māyābhiḥ pururūpa iyate*. Sureśvara interprets the word Indra in the Śruti to mean the Brahman and Indra's powers (*māyās*) as *upādhis*: cf. Śaṅkara on this at BU 2.5.19.

⁷This verse explains the significance of the line *yuktā hy asya*.

⁸This is an elaboration of verse 129, in the form of an illustration with its explanation.

⁹*harayaḥ* are horses, here standing for the sense-organs; cf. KaṭhU 1.3.4: *indriyāṇi hayān āhur.....*

¹⁰According to Sureśvara, *daśa* in the Śruti has to be understood as the sense-organs apart from *manas*. On this, see BU 3.9.4: *daśeme puruṣe prāṇā ātmaikādaśaḥ*; and also BSB 2.4.6 (p. 635) wherein BU 3.9.4 is referred to and explained.

¹¹This is owing to ignorance.

¹²This is the explanation of *prāṇibheda* 'notion of discreteness of beings' in the last quarter *harayaḥ śatā daśa*.

नान्यो हेतुरविज्ञानादिन्द्रियादेरिहात्मनि ।
यतोऽयमेव हरयो यावत्संख्या तदाश्रया ॥१३२॥
अयमेवेन्द्रियत्वेन देहत्वेन च कल्पितः ।
तथा शतसहस्रादिसंख्याभेदेन चाप्ययम् ॥१३३॥
नामरूपक्रियाभेदैर्यथा पूर्वमवादिषम् ।
अयमेव तथारूपः कल्पितोऽविद्ययाद्वयः ॥१३४॥
तदेतत्कल्पितं सर्वं सहेतु फलवज्जगत् ।
प्रत्यगात्मात्मकं भास्वत्प्रज्ञानघनतत्त्वकम् ॥१३५॥

[These verses explain BU 2.5.19: *ayam vai harayaḥ ayam vai daśa ca sahasrāṇi bahūni cānantāni ca* in relation to *yuktā hy asya...*]

There is no other cause than ignorance about the sense-organs etc. (that makes one feel their being supported) in the Ātman, since this one itself is the horses (i.e. sense-organs), (therefore) whatever (be) the number (of them), they are dependent on it. [132]

The same Ātman is conceived as being the organs and the body, so also (is) this one (known) by the various numbers, a hundred, a thousand etc. [133]

The same Ātman, (who is) formless (and) one without a second, is conceived by discrete names, forms and actions on account of ignorance, as I have discussed (lit. stated) earlier. [134]

All this universe is then conceived as having a cause and (also) as having an effect; (nevertheless) being of the nature of the individual consciousness and a shining mass of consciousness in its (true) nature.¹ [135]

¹The world, a product of ignorance, is conceived to be consisting of causes and effects, though it is in reality of the nature of the Ātman.

निःशेषोपनिषत्सारस्तदेतदिति सांप्रतम् ।

उक्त्याविष्क्रियते साक्षात्करविन्यस्तबिल्ववत् ॥१३६॥

[Sureśvara states how the previous discussion on the *ṛks* to the Aśvins have lead one to understand the general purport of the Upaniṣads. It is specifically re-affirmed in the statement *tad etat...*]

The statement *tad etat* is now the essence of all Upaniṣads without exception. The Śruti reveals it directly (just) like a Bilva fruit put on a hand. [136]

अज्ञातं संशयज्ञातं मिथ्याज्ञातमिदं जगत् ।

तदेतदित्यनूद्यैतत्तत्त्वमवबोध्यते ॥१३७॥

Having reiterated in the statement *tad etat* that this universe is (really) not known, known with doubt (about its true nature) and known falsely, (the Śruti) informs (us) of its true nature. [137]

ब्रह्मेति वास्तवं वृत्तं तावदस्यावबोध्यते ।

ज्ञानात्पुरापि ब्रह्मैव नातो ज्ञानफलं भवेत् ॥१३८॥

To begin with, the real nature of this (world) is stated in the word *brahman*, viz. this (world) is the Brahman itself,¹ even before the knowledge of the true (is acquired by one). Hence, this cannot be the result of knowledge.² [138]

¹This explains the meaning of the word *brahman*.

²This sets aside the popular notion that knowledge occurs to one as the result of some activity. Cf. Śaṅkara's refutation of this notion in BSB 1.1.4 (pp. 125-128)

अपूर्वमिति कार्यत्वनिषेधायाभिधीयते ।

कारणत्वनिषेधाय तथानपरगीरियम् ॥१३६॥

The word *apūrva* is uttered for declining the notion that it is of the nature of an effect; so also the word *anapara* is (uttered) for rejecting the notion that it is of the nature of a cause.¹

[139]

¹This brings out the significance of the words *apūrva* and *anaparam*.

अनन्तरमिति तयो रन्ध्रस्य प्रतिषेधनम् ।

कार्यकारणयोर्बाह्यमबाह्यमिति वार्यते ॥१४०॥

The word *anantara* is for setting aside the notion of any distinction of (the Brahman) from the two. So also, by the word *abāhya* is warded off the notion that the Brahman is kept outside i.e. away from any cause and its effect.

[140]

सत्ता वानन्तरगिरा ब्रह्मणः प्रतिषिध्यते ।

विशेषोऽबाह्यशब्देन ततो वाक्यार्थरूपकम् ॥१४१॥

Or, by the word *anantara* is denied the existence of the Brahman (as a discrete object); so also, by the word *abāhya* (is denied that it is) the distinctive feature (of the discrete objects)—from that (comes to the fore) the explanation of the sentence-sense (viz. the uniqueness of the Ātman).

[141]

नात्मनोऽन्यत्र संभाव्यमपूर्वादि यदीरितम् ।

ब्रह्मात्मैवेत्यतो वक्ति श्रुतिरैकात्म्यसिद्धये ॥१४२॥

पारोक्ष्यप्रतिषेधार्थं ब्रह्मात्मैवेति भण्यते ।

ब्रह्मैवात्मेति च तथा संसारित्वनिवृत्तये ॥१४३॥

भिन्नं ब्रह्मापरिज्ञानात्संसारित्वं तथात्मनः ।

तत्त्वज्ञानात्तमोऽध्वस्तौ नेतीत्यात्मावशिष्यते ॥१४४॥

[These verses explain *ayam ātmā brahma*]

Whatever was stated with the word *apūrva* in the beginning cannot be possible in respect of anything else than the Ātman. Hence, the Śruti asserts that the Brahman is but the Ātman so that the uniqueness of the Ātman is established.¹ [142]

The statement, 'The Brahman is but the Ātman' is made, for rejecting the non-immediateness (of the Brahman). So also, the statement, 'The Brahman alone is the Ātman' is made in order to reject the idea of transmigratoriness (of the Brahman). [143]

Owing to the non-knowing (of it), the Brahman is taken as distinct (from other objects); in the same way, transmigratoriness (is stated) of the Ātman. When there occurs the destruction of darkness (viz. ignorance) at (the rise of) the knowledge of the true nature of the Ātman, there remains (only the awareness that) the Ātman is (to be described as) 'Not this, not this'. [144]

¹This sums up the explanation of the words, viz *apūrva*, *anapara*, *anantara* and *abāhya* and conveys that the Brahman is *avyāvṛtta*, *ananugata*, *niḥsāmānyaviśeṣa* as said earlier in verse 6.

सर्वोऽनुभव एवायमतः सर्वानुभूः परः ।

कात्स्न्यत्सर्वो भवेदेष चिन्मात्रत्वात्तथाऽनुभूः ॥१४५॥

All this (universe) is but the (object of) experience, beyond this is the experiencer of all, because of its fullness, it is all. So also, because of its nature of (being) Sentiency alone, it is the experiencer.¹ [145]

¹This is an explanation of the word *sarvānubhūḥ* in the end of BU 2.5.19.

इतीत्युक्तपरामर्शो वेदाज्ञा चानुशासनम् ।

कर्तव्यमेतद्विज्ञानमिति वेदानुशासनम् ॥१४६॥

The word *iti* is the reference to what is (already) stated;

the Vedic teaching is the instruction. The words *kartavyam etad vijñānam* are the instruction.¹ [146]

¹This is the explanation of *ity anusāsanam*.

अस्यातिलङ्घने दोषः संसारानर्थसंगतिः ।

कुर्वतश्च महाँलाभ आत्मनः कृतकृत्यता ॥१४७॥

In transgressing this (instruction regarding acquiring Knowledge), there occurs the fault, viz. the association with, (the) undesirable object, viz. transmigratory existence. There will be great benefit accruing to one who is doing it (viz. the instruction of the Śruti).¹ The Ātman will have done what has to be done (viz. one will be liberated). [147]

¹Following the instruction mentioned in the preceding verse.

इति द्वितीयाध्यायस्य पञ्चमं मधुब्राह्मणं समाप्तम्